

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/687,365	10/16/2003	Ying-Chien Lin	406500	406500 9291	
27717	590 07/27/2005		EXAM	INER	
SEYFARTH SHAW			ZEWDU, MELESS NMN		
55 EAST MO	NROE STREET				
SUITE 4200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60603-5803			2683	-	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/687,365	LIN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Meless N. Zewdu	2683				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.					
Disposition of Claims		•				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 16 October 2003 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ■ All b) ■ Some * c) ■ None of: 1. ■ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ■ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ■ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/687,365 Page 2

Art Unit: 2683

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is the first on the merit of the instant application.

2. Claims 1-7 are pending in this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art (APA) in view of Bork et al. (Bork) (US 6,633,932 B1).

Regarding claim 1: the applicant's admitted prior art (APA) discloses a wireless transmission apparatus comprising:

a wired network port for exchanging data with a computer (see fig. 2a, element 18; page 1, lines 14-17).

a wireless network port including a radio frequency circuit module (see fig. 2a, element 38; page 1, lines 17-26).

a processing unit for converting the data format transmitted between the wired network port and the wireless network port (see fig. 2a, element 34; page 1, lines 24-26). But, the APA does not explicitly teach about a power port electrically connected to

Art Unit: 2683

a universal series bus (USB) of the computer, by which the wireless transmission apparatus is powered, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Bork teaches about a power port electrically connected to a universal series bus of the computer, by which the wireless transmission apparatus is powered (see entire document, particularly, figs. 13, 15-16-18, 20-22; abstract; col. 2, lines 21-48; col. 6, line 27-col. 7, line 12). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify applicant's admitted prior art (APA) with the teaching of Bork for the advantage of facilitating the elimination of a need for a power cable that couples cellular phone to a dedicated power source (see col. 7, lines 56-67).

Regarding claim 3: Bork teaches a wireless transmission apparatus, wherein the power port is a universal series bus port (see abstract; fig. 16, elements 58, 42 and 60; col. 2, lines 21-48).

Regarding claim 4: Bork teaches a wireless transmission apparatus further comprising a universal series bus wire connected to the power port (see fig. 16, element 58, col. 2, lines 36-48).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Norimatsu (US 5,465,400). **As per claim 2:** the above references (particularly Bork) teaches a power controller (fig. 13, elements 26, 38, 16 and 14; col. 6, lines 34-38) comprising a voltage transformer/converter adapted to convert a voltage of the power port to a voltage suitable for the operation of the wireless communication apparatus (see col. 6, lines 39-

Art Unit: 2683

42). But, the above references do not explicitly teach about a power-saving controller adapted to suspend the power supply to the radio frequency circuit module according to a power control signal generated by the processing unit, as claimed by applicant.

However, in a related field of endeavor, Norimatsu teaches about a power supply control device for controlling the turning ON and OFF of a power supply, wherein a battery operated portable radio communication apparatus (fig. 2; col. 1, lines 16-20) is provided with power supply control circuit (fig. 2, block 300; col. 3, lines 46-53) for suspending (turning ON/OFF) power supply to radio frequency circuit module (col. 2, lines 15-24; col. 5, lines 14-21) according to a power control signal (PS) (col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the above references with the teaching of Norimatsu for the advantage of turning OFF the power supply circuit to a radio transceiver when no power is needed so as to maximize the useful life of a battery (see col. 1, lines 16-20).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bryson (US 2004/0185777 A1).

As per claim 5: but, the above references do not explicitly teach about a wireless transmission apparatus, wherein the wired network port uses a communication protocol, which complies with the IEEE 802.3 standard, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Bryson teaches that devices like, cell phones, laptop computers, personal digital assistants (PDA) and pagers include means, such as (IEEE

802.3) and USB ports, for connecting the devices to other devices and networks (see abstract; page 1, paragraphs 0002-0003). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the references applied to claim 1 with the teaching of Bryson for the advantage of providing connection to other devices and networks, as taught by Bryson.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bauchot (US 5,970,062). Regarding claim 6: in the discussion, regarding the rejection of claim 1 above, it is shown that the APA discloses wireless communication apparatus (an access point) (fig. 3a, element 90) adapted to exchange data between a wired network (computer 60 via bus 72) and wireless network (via element/antenna 92) using network interface ports, wherein the APA is modified to have a universal series bus (USB) (see the discussion in claim 1). But, the references applied to claim 1 do not explicitly teach about a wireless transmission apparatus (access point) comprising a memory for storing data transmitted between the wired network port and the wireless network port, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Bauchot teaches a wireless access point (fig. 1, block 18 or 20; col. 7, lines 24-29) adapted to communicate with a computer (wired network) and wireless network (mobile terminals (fig. 1, elements 10, 12, 14 or 16) wherein the access point includes a memory (fig. 2, element 70) for storing data transmitted between the wired network port/computer and wireless network port (see col. 7, lines 36-60; col. 19, line 38-col. 20, line 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

Art Unit: 2683

modify the references applied to claim 1 with the teaching of Bauchot for the advantage of enabling users of the modified APA's access point (see rejection of claim 1) provide access to different communication technologies (see col. 5, lines 43-59), as taught by Bauchot.

As per claim 7: Bauchot teaches a wireless transmission apparatus (wireless access point) comprising a memory controller for controlling the data access of the memory (see fig. 2, elements 64 and 70; col. 7, lines 46-60).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meless N. Zewdu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7873. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (571) 272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2683

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Page 7

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hudy beless

Meless Zewdu

Examiner

22 July 2005.